

The University of Chicago

LITERARY EDITORSHIP IN
THE SECOND AND THIRD QUARTOS
OF BEAUMONT AND FLETCHER'S
CUPID'S REVENGE

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE
FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF
PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
SEPTEMBER, 1942

By
JAMES EDWIN SAVAGE

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
1946

The University of Chicago

LITERARY EDITORSHIP IN
THE SECOND AND THIRD QUARTOS
OF BEAUMONT AND FLETCHER'S
CUPID'S REVENGE

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE
FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF
PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE
SEPTEMBER, 1942

By
JAMES EDWIN SAVAGE

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1946



CHAPTER IX

THE QUARTOS OF 1630 AND 1635

A recent study by Matthew W. Black and Matthias A. Shaaber¹ points out, on the basis of a vast body of variants, that the second, third, and fourth folios of the Shakespeare text were critical editions, supervised by men of a somewhat higher order of talents than the regular press-correctors of the printing houses. Suggestions of a similar nature had been made earlier by Allardyce Nicoll.²

The second and third quartos of Cupid's Revenge have been edited in a manner very similar to that described by Messrs. Black and Shaaber. The second edition of this play appeared in 1630, with a large body of changes from the text that had appeared in the first edition. For most of these, an editor probably can not be held responsible; but there is a core of altered readings, many of which are defensible on the basis of their context, which seem to be the work, not of a press-corrector, but of a man of letters. Retained in the third quarto, 1635, and in the Beaumont and Fletcher folio of 1679, these readings have remained a part of the text of Cupid's Revenge, whether in Dyce's version, or that of the Cambridge edition. The situation becomes more inter-

¹Matthew W. Black and Matthias A. Shaaber, Shakespeare's Seventeenth Century Editors, (New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1937). Conclusions, cf., pp. 95-97.

²Allardyce Nicoll, "The Editors of Shakespeare from the First Folio to Malone," Studies in the First Folio, (London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1924).

esting, if also more complicated, by reason of a second editorial treatment in the third quarto. Again a large body of variants appears, superimposed upon the work of the first editor. Again, there is a core of good new readings which have found their way into the modern texts.

The total number of variants in the two quartos is something over four thousand, most of which, of course, are minor variations in spelling and punctuation. But as a basis for this chapter I selected a group of changes, seventy-nine from the second quarto, and fifty from the third, each of which answered to one, or both, of two requirements: that it offer some change significant for the sense of the play, or that it reveal something about the character of the editorship, or the editor. Only a portion of the second quarto variants can be reproduced, and very few of those from the third. By way, therefore, of showing the importance, and to a lesser extent, the excellence of this early editorial work, I propose to point out briefly the proportions in which my one hundred and twenty-nine variants have remained in later editions of the text of Cupid's Revenge.

Of the seventy-nine second quarto variants to which I shall make reference, seventy-seven were retained in the third quarto. The text of Cupid's Revenge in the folio of 1679 is based wholly on the second quarto, retaining seventy-eight of its variants. Tonson, 1711, followed the second folio, with no reference to the third quarto. His successors followed his lead, basing their texts largely on his, and retaining almost the same number of second quarto readings: Seward, seventy-five; Colman, seventy-six; Weber, seventy-six; Darley, seventy-three; and Dyce, sixty-two. The Cambridge edition is a reprint of the second folio, though it contains only seventy-two of the second quarto

readings.

That, however, is only part of the history of the text of Cupid's Revenge, as it is influenced by the seventeenth century editors; for the third quarto, though it was not used in the preparation of the second folio text, or Tonson's edition, was used by all the editors thereafter. The second quarto text, as preserved in the second folio, still remained basic; but readings from Q3 which appeared to the editors as more satisfactory were introduced into the text. Of the fifty Q3 readings on which this study is based, Seward accepted twenty-six; Colman, forty; Weber, forty-one; Darley, forty; and Dyce, thirty-five. Of my group of one hundred and twenty-nine variants in the two early quartos, Weber, who retains most, has one hundred and seventeen; and Dyce, who keeps fewest, has ninety-seven. Nor do these gentlemen always give credit for their adopted readings to the proper source, the anonymous editorship of the quartos of 1630 and 1635.

Such ambitious editorial efforts as these deserve an analysis which will reveal the achievements and the shortcomings of the tasks performed. It is my purpose in this chapter to set forth a group of these readings, sufficiently large and varied to show that the work partook of the nature of literary editorship, rather than that of the ordinary press-correcting that was done in the seventeenth century, and to make such comments as the evidence warrants about the manner in which the work was done, and about the person or persons responsible for the two editorial treatments.

In dealing with two texts which vary so much as do the first and second quartos of Cupid's Revenge, one immediately faces the question of whether one is indeed a reprint of the other, rather than a separate version. There is little doubt,

Q1. Of the seventy-seven in the play, seventy-two are identical in the two quartos; three are corrections which substitute the name of the speaker for the first word of his speech; and two vary because of the exigencies of printing. But their evidence also points to the fact that the compositor of Q2 was using a copy of Q1: page I3v of Q1 has one less than its normal quota of lines, thirty-seven. So the compositor brings forward a line from I4r; then on that page, to get back to normal, he takes a short speech, "Dor. How!," from a line which it occupies with another speech, and gives it a separate line. A similar situation prevails in the case of the differing catchword of K3r, except that in that case the following page has thirty-eight lines, one too many.

Other, more minute evidence that the compositor of Q2 was using a copy of Q1 is furnished by the fact that Q2 retains such incorrect spellings as "frontlets" for frontless, and "ladst" for lad's; and by the retention of improper margins. For, on four occasions the compositor of Q1, instead of bringing his line properly to the left margin of his page, began it improperly three spaces to the right, under a preceding speech-prefix. The compositor of Q2 faithfully reproduced the mistakes.

It is possible to go one step farther than I have gone, in establishing the ancestry of Q2. Numerous variants, caused by corrections made during the process of printing, occur among the various copies of Q1. By means of these variants, each copy of the first quarto can be analysed roughly into a combination of corrected and uncorrected gatherings. When these variants are traced into the second quarto, it is possible to determine with reasonable assurance that the combination of gatherings which was the ancestor of Q2 was the same as that which is to be found in

the one of the two copies in the Huntington Library which they designate as the "Chew" copy.

The changes between the two quartos represent, then, not two different versions of the text of Cupid's Revenge, but alterations of the text presented in the quarto of 1615. Though it is proposed here to show that there was a systematic process of revision applied to the text, prior to the printing of the 1630 quarto, it is not at all suggested that the "editor" is responsible for all of the large number of variants between the two quartos. I have tabulated 1179, which for the purposes of this chapter I have found it convenient to group under the following headings: Words, Rhyme, Verse, Speech-prefixes, Stage-directions, Grammar, and Punctuation. The variants range in character from changes based on a minute analysis of context, to the most stupid errors in punctuation. It seems obvious that the variants to be found at the two extremes are not to be assigned to the same person; but my purpose is not to deal with the whole mass of changes. It is rather to present a carefully selected group of variants, which seem to reveal the hand of a literate man, in order to show the character of the editorship which took place.

The group of changes which has had most influence on the modern text of Cupid's Revenge is that which I have classified under the heading of "Words." I include here only variants in which a whole word, or group of words has been added to the text, or has been substituted for something already in the text, with the purpose, apparently, of reforming either the sense or the scansion. The division of the variants into the two classes, insertions and substitutions, makes for economy in handling them. That I do not also include omissions of words is due merely to the fact that no particularly significant variants of that type

occur. Act and scene references are to the 1843 Dyce edition; page and line references to the 1615 quarto. No separate reference is made to the 1630 quarto, for its page and line correspond in every case to those of Q1. I underline in each case the significant word or words which have been changed. Variants quoted or described are given numbers which run consecutively throughout the chapter.

1. Q1: Leon. No newes yet my Sonne?
 Q2: Leon. No newes yet of my Sonne?
 (I, 1v, C3r, 25)

Leucippus has been absent for five days, during which time his father, Leontius, has heard nothing from him. He is here inquiring of the courtiers if they know the whereabouts of Leucippus. The change is a necessary one.

2. Q1: Hida. Alas old man, Death hath more dores th~~er~~ one,
 And will meete him.
 Q2: And I will meet him
 (I, 1v, C4v, 21-22)

Hidaspes's father, the "old man," has just condemned her lover to death; she has in the previous line threatened to kill herself, and is here repeating the threat.

3. Q1: Leuc. I could tell the world what thou hast done.
 Q2: Leu. I could tell all the world what thou hast done.
 (II, 11, D2r, 11)

The only apparent purpose of this addition is to secure a line of ten syllables; similar additions for the sake of scansion are made on C4r, lines 5 and 7, and L2v, line 17.

4. Q1: If not for of mee, yet of your selfe
 Away, for you can bring no comfort to mee.
 Q2: If not for loue of mee,
 (II, 11, D2v, 34-35)

5. Q1: Isme. If you haue layne with her tell your Father,
 No doubt he has done as ill before now:
 Q2: No doubt but he has done as ill before now:
 (II, 11, D3v, 21-22)

The insertion of "but" is acceptable from the point of view of

syntax, though somewhat pedantic. The editor may have conceived that it helped the scansion of a harsh line.

6. Q1: Cleo. Giuen Eare-rings we will weare,
 Bracelets of our Louers haire,
 Which they on our Armes shall twist,
 With theyr Names caru'd on wrist,
 (II, iiii, E3r, 22-25)

The 1630 quarto reproduces this passage almost exactly, except that it inserts "our" before "wrist" in the fourth line. The lines are a part of a prayer to Cupid, pledging closer observance of his rites if he will save Hidaspes. Of the eighteen lines in the group, all but three are composed of seven syllables, with four stresses, after the pattern of the first three here quoted. Of the three which do not conform to the pattern, the lines of one couplet open with unstressed syllables; line 25 is the other. The insertion of "our" is the obvious means of making it conform to the design in which the whole prayer is conceived.

7. Q1: Age. Shee may aske but one, may she?
Nis. A hundred times this day if shee will;
 Q2: She may aske but once, may she?
 (I, i, Blv, 9-10)

The "once" of Q2 may possibly be attributable to a compositor whose memory substituted the longer word for the similar short one. But the context suggests the possibility of a deliberate change. Earlier in the passage, Agenor and Nisus have been talking about the request of Hidaspes, wondering whether she may ask one "thing" or more than one. With this part of the conversation, which is some fifteen lines back, the "one" agrees. On the other hand, Nisus replies to Agenor's question with the words "A hundred times." It appears that the editor chose to print "once," as agreeing with this reply, in the next line, rather than to retain the "one" which agrees with the much earlier "thing."

8. Q1: Age. Berlady we are like to haue a long Lent ont,
 Flesh will be flesh:
 Q2: Flesh shall be flesh:
 (I, i, B3r, 31-32)

At the request of Leucippus and Hidaspes, their father, Leontius, has decreed that the worship of Cupid shall be abandoned as the religion of Lycia. Three courtiers are discussing in bawdy terms the results to themselves of the ban. In the reference to Lent there is, of course, a pun on the word "flesh"; the reference is not to flesh as food, but to flesh as human nature. The same meaning is retained in the next line: "Flesh will be flesh." The NED gives a meaning for will, at the time of this play, and in such a construction as that here used, of "is fully determined to," or "insists on or persists in"; it illustrates by a quotation from Chapman's Iliad, 1611. Therefore, whether or not the authors so intended it, the expression "Flesh will be flesh" means something of this sort: "flesh will persist in the habits of the flesh." But such a meaning is in direct contradiction to the first part of the statement--"we shall have a long Lent ont." For the most obvious fact about Lent is that flesh is forbidden, as James I regularly intimated to his subjects early in the year. Let the bawdy meaning intended by the courtiers be substituted for the legitimate meaning, and the contradiction between the two parts of the statement becomes apparent.

With the substitution of "shall," the difficulty is removed. The NED speaks of shall, in general, as used "to express necessity of many kinds"; more specifically, it says the word may be used "when the speaker is placing himself in another's point of view." With "shall" substituted for "will," the phrase repeats the idea of the preceding line, and it may be paraphrased thus: "That which is forbidden must remain forbidden."

I have labored this point somewhat, for it furnishes an excellent commentary on the nature of the task undertaken by the man who worked on the play in 1630. The fact that the authors

probably wrote "will" was of small concern to him; but to clarify their ideas, or at least their grammar, was of some significance.

9. Q1: Priest. Come my children, let your feete,
In an euen Measure meete:
And your cheerefull voyces rise,
For to present this Sacrifice
Lo great Cupid, in whose name,
I his Priest begin the same.

Q2: To great Cupid,

(I, ii, B4r, 17-22)

Two alternatives face any editor in attempting to deal with this passage: he may place a stop after "Sacrifice," and retain the "Lo"; or he may accept the punctuation as it stands, and print "To" instead. The latter arrangement, perhaps, gives a more satisfactory reading from the point of syntax, and would therefore appeal more strongly to our editor, who, as has already been shown, is something of a grammarian.

10. Q1: . . . Nor is it in the power of man
To robbe me farther: if you can inuent
Spare not; No naked man feares robbing lesse
Then you doe: now you may for euer stay.

(II, ii, D2r, 1-4)

The substitution is that of "I" for the first "you" in line four. The speech is Bacha's, but was wrongly assigned to Leucippus in the first quarto. It is probable that the "you" was at some time inserted to agree with the incorrect assignment. Both the errors are corrected in Q2.

11. Q1: Tim. You doe not know what tis to be a Queene,
Goe to your Maide, else what the olde man falls short
of, theres others can eech out, when you please to call
on em.

Q2: Goe too you Maide,

(II, iv, E4v, 28-31)

This passage has given commentators on the play a great deal of trouble;¹ Dyce has probably arrived at the true solution, in

¹Q3 followed Q2, except that it omitted "else"; F2 and Tonson follow Q2; Seward printed "you're mad, else what"; Colman, "you're made. What"; Weber, "you're made! Else what."

printing "Go to, you're mad else. What." But the editor of Q2 deserves the credit of solving the basic difficulty, that of making the "to" an adverb, rather than the preposition it appears to be in Q1.

12. Q1: Tima. Worthy Ismenus, I pray how haue you sped
in your warres?

Q2: Tima. Worthy Ismenus, I pray you, haue you sped
(III, 11, F2r, 15, 16)

The compositor, rather than the editor, is probably responsible for changing "how" to "you." For in two other speeches in the same passage,¹ the same introductory formula, "pray how," is used in Q1; in neither of these is the "how" disturbed. It is not an editorial change for the sake of scansion, for the whole passage is in prose. The line involves a problem of justification in Q2, and the comma may have been inserted by the compositor as the solution of the problem.

13. Q1: Timantus. Your grace has chosen out an ill obseruer.

Leon. Yes I meane of his ill: you take rightly.
Q2 Leon. Yes I meane of his ill: you talke rightly.
(III, 1v, G3r, 2-3)

That the correct word here is "take," not "talke," is obvious from both the punning nature of the passage between the two men, and the "But you take me wrong:" of Timantus reply. The change made by the editor of Q2 appears at first glance, however, to be an excellent one.

14. Q1: Leuc. But tis not reason directs thee thus.

Ismen. Then gaue I none at all, for all I haue in mee
Directs mee:

Q2: Ismen. Then haue I none at all,
(IV, 1, H1r, 1-3)

This is probably an error in Q1 which is attributable to foul case. The change is a necessary one.

¹"'Pray how haue you sped here at home at shouelboord?"
"'Pray how is the Prouince settled?" Lines 18 and 23.

15 and 16.

Q1: And what fell miseries the gods can thinke on
Shewe downe vpon her wicked head, she has plotted,
I know too well your death: would my poore life
Or thousand such as mine is might be offered
Like sacrifices vp for your presuming,

Q2: Showre downe vpon her wicked head,

Q2: Like sacrifices vp for your preseruing,
(IV, 1, H3r, 14-18)

Both are excellent corrections; the original mistakes are probably due to a compositor's misreading of his copy.

17. Q1: Bac. Fare thee well. I shal neuer see so braue a G8tl:
Would I could weepe out his offences.

Tim. Or I would weepe (sic) out mine eyes.

Q2: Tim. Or I could weepe out mine eyes.
(IV, 111, 11v, 35-36; I2r, 1)

The speech of Timantus is an elliptical construction, depending for part of its meaning on the previous speech of Bacha, introduced by "Would I"; the Q1 reading therefore has Timantus saying, in effect, "Would I would weepe out mine eyes." The change probably does not restore the text of Beaumont and Fletcher, but in the light of the principles by which this editor is working, it is a good one.

18. Q1: 4. O good morrow Gossip: good morrow all, I
see wee of one minde you cleaue so close together:

Q2: I see/ ye of one minde
(IV, 111, I3v, 2-3)

19. Q1: Nis. We will weepe for ioi sir, farewell.

Q2: Nis. We will weepe for you, Sir: farewell.
(IV, 1v, I4r, 11)

20. Q1: Vra. I pray you let we know whaire the Prince my
brother is.

Q2: Vra. I pray you let mee know
(V, 1, K2r, 30-31)

All three of the changes just shown are necessary, in that their context demands the reading secured in Q2. The original errors in Q1 are all three probably attributable to the compositor, or to the scribe who prepared his copy.

21 and 22.

Q1: Bac. Now pouertie and Leacherie which is thy
end, rot thee, where ere to goest with all thy goodnes.
Timan. Berlady theyle bruze her: and shee weare a
brasse.

Q2: Bac. Now pouerty and Lechery which is thy end, rot
thee, where ere thou goest with all thy goodnes.
Timan. Berlady theyle bruze her: and she were of
brasse.

(V, 1, K3v, 3-6)

The first of these changes, "to" to "thou," is a necessary one.

The second is rather an explanation than an emendation. The NED gives "weare" as an occasional variant spelling of "were"; it also indicates that "a" sometimes appears as a worn-down use of "of." It is so used several times in this play. The very fact that this editor sees fit to make this change, less than twenty years after the play was written, is fairly good evidence that "brasse" was not used in the sense of a garment for the protection of the body.

23. Q1: Yet tell mee ere my breath be gone, knowst
of any other plots against me?

Q2: Yet tell me ere thy breath be gone,
(V, 1v, L2r, 1-2)

This is also a necessary change, for the speech is addressed by Leucippus, who is unharmed, to Timantus, whom he has wounded, and who dies six lines later.

Under the heading of "Rhyme," only two variants are to be discussed, but both throw interesting light on the character and abilities of the editor. They are of such a character that the likelihood of their being made by any other person than a man of letters, intent upon correcting what he regarded as errors in the text before him, is hardly to be entertained. The first of the two presupposes some knowledge of the way in which lyrics were put together, the other an equal knowledge of habits of dramatic writing.

24. Q1: Louers reloyce, your paines shall be rewarded,
The god of loue himselfe grieues at your crying;
No more shall frozen honour be rewarded,

Nor the coy faces of a maid denying.
 Q2: No more shall frozen honour be regarded.
 (I, ii, B4v, 2-5)

There are the first four lines of a song, of two stanzas, each with a rhyme-scheme ababccdd; its only structural defect is that the first and third lines form their rhyme with the same word "rewarded." The editor by substituting "regarded" certainly improved the mechanical structure of the lyric; and he did no injury to the sense. The guard-ward rhyme seems to be a standard one in Renaissance poetry; Shakespeare used it;¹ it appears frequently in Spenser's Faerie Queene;² Mulcaster's Elementarie lists it as a satisfactory rhyme.³ A striking fact about the use of these two words is that in none of the instances of their use which I have found, does one appear as a part of a rhyme which does not contain the other. The 1630 editor may, however, have had a better reason than this general practice for making the change. The principal source of Cupid's Revenge is the Arcadia, its first act being based on the beginning of the story of Erona; it can also be shown that Beaumont and Fletcher used both the "Old" Arcadia and the "New" Arcadia. In the former, just preceding the first account of Erona's troubles,⁴ appears this passage:

As, the one half saying, Wee love, and have oure Loves rewarded;
the others woulde answer, Wee love, and are no whitt regarded.
The first ageane, Wee fynde moste sweete affections snaire:
with like tyme, yt shoulde bee (as in a Quiere) sent back ageane, That sweete, but sowre dispayrefull care.
A third tyme likewyse thus, Who can dispayre, whome

¹Lucrece, stanza 44, and Sonnet 133.

²Faerie Queene, II, vii, 47; II, viii, 2; III, i, 27; III, ii, 7; III, x, 31; V, i, 30.

³Mulcaster's Elementarie, edited with an introduction by E. T. Champagnac, (Oxford: At the University Press, 1925), p. 144.

⁴Albert Feuillerat, The Works of Sir Philip Sidney, (4 vols.; Cambridge: At the University Press, 1912-1926), IV, 63-64.

hope doth beare?: The answer, And who can hope, who feeles
dispayre?. Then all joyning theyre voyces, and daunsing a
faster measure, they woulde conclude with some suche wordes,
As withoute breathe, no Pype doth moove; No Musick kyndly
withoute Love.¹

Both this passage and the Erona story with which it is associated appear also in the "New" Arcadia, in substantially the same form.² That Beaumont and Fletcher's lyric was suggested by Sidney's eglogue is very probable. Is it not quite possible that the second quarto editor, when he changed the second "rewarded" to "regarded," may have been influenced by part, or all, of the circumstances just indicated?

At any rate, the editor was very probably restoring what the authors actually wrote. For it seems quite possible that the printer of the first quarto introduced the error, printing "re-warded," which his mind retained from the first line of the poem, rather than the proper "regarded."

25. Q1: In ai day my brother shall be taught that I was
Euer good, though she were naught.

Q2: In ai day my brother shall be taught
That I was euer good, though she were naught.
(V, 1, K3r, 19-20)

The printing of Q1 rather thoroughly obscures this rhyme. It comes at the end of a scene, and in view of the fact that Beaumont and Fletcher closed so many of their scenes with couplets,³ there is little doubt that this was intended to be such a rhyme. The editor, however, failed to notice and change a similar situation at the end of Act I, Scene iii.

It has already been suggested in connection with the reviser's insertion of certain words that he was seeking to reform

¹Ibid., pp. 53-54.

²Feuillerat, op. cit., I, 126-127.

³Of the twenty-two scenes in Cupid's Revenge (as divided by Dyce), nine end in rhyme.

the scansion of the lines concerned. It has also been remarked that the printer on numerous occasions transferred words in prose passages from the beginning of one line to the end of the preceding one because the size of the type, or the dimensions of his page, allowed him to print one or two more letters to the line. The half dozen variants included under the heading of "Verse" are concerned rather with printing than with insertion or omission of words. But all are changes, not in any sense called for by the necessities of printing, which restore to verse form passages originally printed as prose.

26. Q1: Bac. I thanke you, and will let you know the busi-
 nesse: So I may haue your helpes, neuer be doubtfull,
 Q2: Bac. I thanke you, and will let you know the businesse:
 (III, iv, G4r, 15-16)

27. Q1: Saue thy selfe, why doest thou weepe? Alas I doe not
 chide thee. (V, iv, K4v, 1-2)
 Q2: Saue thy selfe; why doest thou weepe?
 Alas, I doe not chide thee. (V, iv, K4v, 3-4)

28. Q1: Leu. Would you had loue within you, and such
 Griefe as might become a Mother: looke you there,
 Q2: Leu. Would you had loue within you, and such Griefe
 As might become a Mother: looke you there,
 (V, iv, L2v, 28-29)

The first of these three changes might have been a compositor's happy accident; but the other two can indicate nothing but conscious efforts to improve the printing of the verse.

Two other rearrangements of lines are interesting from still another point of view, in that they throw some light on the manner in which the editor may have made his corrections. I quote each passage at some length, in order to show the relation between the change and the page on which it occurs.

29. Q1: Age. Well, let come what will come,
 I am but one, and as the plague falles,
 Ile shape my selfe: If women will be honest, Ile be
 (Catchword) Sound.
 Sound, if the god be not too vnmercifull,
 Ile take a little still where I can get it,

And thanke him, and say nothing. (sound.
 Q2: Ile shape my selfe: If women will be honest, Ile be
 (Catchword) If

If the god be not too vnnmercifull,
 (I, 1, B3v, 32-35; B4r, 1-3)

The transfer of "Sound" to the position it occupies in the second quarto improves two lines of verse, in that it places "Sound" in its proper position from the points of view of both meter and syntax. But the change produces in B3v, 34, a line of seven feet. We have seen the editor preoccupied with problems of proper line length and number of syllables to the extent that he is willing to insert words in the text. Dyce makes a new division of this passage, and produces seven lines of verse. It seems unlikely that the editor of Q2, who studied the passage to the extent of transferring a word from one page to another; and who, as we have seen in the first part of this section, did not hesitate to rearrange lines on certain occasions, would have failed to observe the possibility of rearranging this passage into more acceptable verse. I suggest that the reason he did not do so was this: he had before him a copy of the quarto of 1615, which he was correcting, writing his alterations in the margin. But in view of the fact that Q2 is a page for page reprint of Q1, he was not permitted by the printer to make changes that would add to the total number of lines on any given page.

30. Q1: Bac: Growne so godly: this must not bee. And
 I wilbe to you, no other then a natural Mother ought:
 (Catchword) And
 And for my honestie, so you will sweare
 Neuer to vrge me, I shall keep it safe from any other.
 Q2: And I wil be to you, no other then a natural Mother ought
 (Catchword) And
 (III, 11, F3r, 35-37; F3v, 1-2)

To get the "And" of line 35 on line 36 so taxed the compositor's resources that he was unable to include the colon after "ought," but it did not require an additional line. This passage, too,

according to Dyce, who makes four lines and two half lines of it, is susceptible to better arrangement. That, for the reasons already indicated, the editor failed to make any further rearrangement, bears out the suggestion that he was making his corrections in a copy of Q1.

The editor of the 1630 quarto found occasion to make eleven changes in the speech-prefixes, most of which are necessary corrections, and need not be quoted. In one case, he supplies a prefix which had been omitted in the 1615 quarto;¹ he removes two superfluous prefixes;² he awards to the right person four speeches obviously wrongly assigned;³ in one case he makes a redistribution of speeches where the correct arrangement is doubtful; and three times he makes changes which are obviously wrong. Only the four variants last mentioned need to be reproduced.

38. Q1: Cleo. Helpe! stirre her: Hero: Hida: ô, ô.
 Q2: Cleo. Helpe! Hero: Stirre her: Hida. ô, ô,
 (II, v, E3r, 9)

As the line appears in Q1, the waiting woman Hero is made to address the princess by her name, a thing which she does no where else in the play; or else Cleophila says "Helpe! stirre her: Hero:". The latter reading would be acceptable, except that it is farther from what seems to be the intent of the punctuation than the 1630 reading. All subsequent editions of the play, with the single exception of Seward's, follow the revision made by the editor of 1630.

¹31. IV, 11, 11r, 27.

²32. III, 1v, G3v, 16; 33. V, 1v, L1r, 1.

³34. II, 11, D1v, 32; 35. II, 1v, E1v, 34; 36. III, 11, F3v, 17; 37. III, 1v, G3r, 26.

39. Q1: Leon. My Gowne? why, am I sick? bring mee
my Sword. Exit Tela.
Timantus, Let a couple of the great horses be brought
out for vs.
Q2: Leon. Let a couple of the great horses be brought
out for vs.

(II, 1v, E2v, 15-18)

The 1615 reading is correct, with Timantus as a noun of address, except for the odd arrangement of lines. It is surprising that the editor should make this mistake, for as I have pointed out, he corrected three similar errors.

40. Q1: Enter Hidaspes: Cleophila, and Hero, Hidaspes in a Bedde.
Hees dead, hees dead, and I am following.

(II, v, E3r, 6-7)

These are the first two lines of Act II, Scene v. The speech belongs to Hidaspes, who is dying because her lover has been put to death. Q2 incorrectly reverses the order of the two lines, an arrangement which has the effect of putting Hidaspes's speech in the previous scene, and making it a part of a mocking speech by Timantus, whom some one, probably this same editor, in a list of characters prefixed to the 1630 edition, calls a "villanous sycophant."

41. Q1: Ism. I am ready.
Agenor, goe and let the Trumpets sound
Some mournefull thing,
Q2: Ism. I am ready.
Agenor. Goe and let the Trumpets sound

(V, 1v, L3v, 15-17)

In this case, as in variant 39, the editor has mistaken a noun of address for a speech-prefix; but here, instead of substituting another speaker, he has appointed the person addressed to be the rightful speaker. His choice is mistaken, for this is the first order of Ismenus, who has become king as a result of the deaths of Leontius and Leucippus, and is here making dispositions for the accumulated bodies.

The changes in stage-directions are neither very numerous,

nor very important. I record them to emphasize the facts that the editor was neglecting no part of his copy, and that he was constantly thinking as he worked in terms of the context.

42. Q1: Enter Hidaspis and Nisus.

Q2: Enter Hidaspes, Nisus, and Zoylous.

(I, iv, C3v, 18)

The latter is correct; for Hidaspes has brought Zoilus with her, in order to ask her father to give him to her for a husband. It is interesting to note also, that the form "Hidaspis" has been corrected; and the spelling "Zoylous," which appears very rarely in either of the quartos, has been introduced.

43. At the end of Act II, Scene v, (E3v, 12), the editor of Q2 has supplied "Exeunt." Its correctness is questionable: for there have been three persons on the stage; Cleophila has gone off; Hidaspes has died; Hero remains, offering a prayer to Cupid. The "Exeunt." is correct only if it is understood to include the body of Hidaspes.

44. "Exit." is correctly changed to "Exeunt." (IV, iv, I4r, 11)

The beginning of each act, with its first scene only, is marked in Latin. In the first quarto, this Latin is frequently bad. As a result of the work of the 1630 editor, we find fifteen good changes, one bad one, and three failures to make a needed change.¹ These corrections do not suggest a skilled Latinist, but they do indicate one who was at least competent in the rudiments of grammar. The bad change, and the three failures to make a needed change, are of the same character as other alterations

¹The changes may be found on pages B1r, D1r, F1r, and G4v. They fall into these classes: abbreviations correctly written in full, 5; spelling, other than inflections corrected, 7; inflection of adjective changed to agree with noun, 3; abbreviation written in full, not correctly, 1; failure to change noun to proper case, 1; failure to change adjective to agree with noun, 2.

"were." The main clause is "you would not vrge an Oath," with future force. The subjunctive clause, conditional, is "If you know," with present force. This is, grammatically, a satisfactory arrangement. On the other hand, the change represents the conventional form into which such expressions are cast, and there is nothing to indicate that our editor was probing into the problems of the subjunctive. Nor is there any sufficient reason for believing that "know" is not what the authors wrote.

47. Q1: B. O whither will yee me crosse affections pull me?
 Q2: B. O whither will you my crosse affections pull me?
 (IV, ii, H4r, 35)

In his introduction to The Spanish Curate McKerrow has pointed out a characteristic of Fletcher's which has been very useful to all the disintegrators of the Beaumont and Fletcher canon.¹ He showed that Fletcher frequently used "ye" instead of "you" in both nominative and accusative constructions. In view of this known habit of Fletcher's, it is hardly possible to say that any given "ye" should be "you." Though the editor was probably wrong in making this correction, he was on a sounder basis when he changed "me" to "my." The authors probably wrote "ye me," and the compositor's memory preserved the sound of the first word in the second.

48. Q1: why dost you looke so earnestly vpon/ me?
 Q2: why dost thou looke so earnestly vpon me?
 (V, iv, K4v, 20-21)

The adoption of the familiar form in this case differs in almost all particulars from the one treated in 45. Leucippus is here speaking to Urania, the love-lorn maiden who is serving him in disguise of a page. In every other speech of the scene he addresses her with the familiar form, while she consistently ad-

¹A. H. Bullen (ed.), The Works of Francis Beaumont and John Fletcher, Variorum Edition, (London: George Bell and Sons and A. H. Bullen, 1905), II, 104.

dresses him with "you." The verb in line 20, "dost," calls for "thou."

49. Q1: Leu. What art thou, that in this dismall place,
Which nothing could finde out but misery,
Thus boldly stept?

Q2: Thus boldly stepst?

(V, iv, Llr, 5-7)

The use of the present tense in "What art thou," and of "in" rather than "into" in the same line, both suggest that "stepst" is more in keeping with the context than "stept." As a "correction" the change is a good one; but there is no sufficient ground for believing that it is a restoration of the original text.

50. Q1: Here is nor foode, nor beds, nor any house

Q2: Here is no foode, nor beds, nor any house

(V, iv, Llr, 8)

The NED gives the construction used in Q1 as an acceptable one, "especially in poetry," with examples dating near the time of Cupid's Revenge. The change perhaps brings the passage closer to ordinary usage, but it is completely unnecessary.

51. Q1: Bac. Now let heauen fall, I am at the worst of euils,
a thing so miserable wretched, that euery thing, the
last of humane comforts hath left me:

Q2: a thing so miserably wretched,

(V, iv, L3r, 14-16)

This change has the same character as the one just preceding; it is an unnecessary improvement in grammar.¹

To draw a fixed line between the work of the editor and that of the other members of the printing house in matters of spelling and punctuation is of course impossible. Nor do any spelling variants occur which are of particular interest in relation to the problem of editorship. In the punctuation, however, there are certain variant readings, achieved merely by moving or

¹Similar changes designed to improve the grammar can be found on these pages: B3r, 4; C2r, 35; D2r, 7; D4v, 11; Flr, 12; G4v, 25; and I2v, 9.

59. Q1: if thou fal'st off, goe bee a
 Rogue a againe, and lye and Pander to procure thy
 meate: darst thou speake to me. (V, 11, K3v, 22-24)
 Q2: dar'st thou? speake/ to mee?
 (V, 11, K3v, 21-23)

Bacha is here ordering Timantus, who is altogether a coward, to follow Leucippus and stab him. Timantus wishes to refuse, but Bacha overawes him. Just after her instructions to him, and just before the lines quoted, she says "darst thou speake, dar'st thou?" There is no reason to believe that the punctuation in this passage is faulty; and as it stands, it seems to be a threat, saying in effect, "do you dare to dispute my command?" The last line here quoted may be a repetition of the same idea, and if so it too is punctuated correctly in Q1. Modern editors, however, have all followed the lead of Q2, except that they replace the second question mark with a period, Seward even going so far as to reproduce the question mark of "mee?"

I have already made the observation that the punctuation changes in Q2 range from the very good to the extremely bad. The two question marks in variant 59, line 24, illustrate those two extremes. It is unlikely that the man who could insert the first of the marks, or who could make the changes in examples 52, 57, and 58, could also be guilty of the second change. Either compositor or editor may be entitled to the credit for removing the superfluous "a" after "Rogue."

To the group of variants displayed on the preceding pages, a great many others of similar nature might have been added, especially in the paragraphs concerned with punctuation. The ones chosen represent, however, the most significant of the changes which have interest in connection with the text of the play, the quality of the editorial achievement, or the character of the editor. The number and the quality of the variants establish

the chief point that the chapter has thus far sought to emphasize, that some literate person undertook to correct such mistakes as he found in the text of Cupid's Revenge, as set forth in the quarto of 1615.

The classification by which the groups of variants were segregated for analysis was arbitrary; it made for convenience and economy in analyzing the particular variants, but it provides no concise view of the character of the editorial work as a whole. An examination of the individual analyses reveals, however, that the variants fall into three general classes: changes which are required by context; changes which are understandable, or which are perhaps improvements from a literary point of view, but which are not essential for clarity; and changes which are useless, or even wrong.

By "changes required by context," I mean such alterations as remove a discrepancy between a word and the words which surround it. I do not wish to imply that in all these cases the editor of Q2 has restored what the author wrote, for some of the errors that he corrects may have been made by the authors themselves. In fact, the problem of authoritative text concerns us here only secondarily; for we are concerned with the work of one who had in mind certain principles as to what was, or was not, correct writing, and made revisions according to those principles. Our purpose is rather to determine the nature and success of the task that he set for himself.

Identified by specific numbers, either in the text of this chapter, or in the footnotes, are fifty-nine variant second quarto readings. Of these, I class thirty-seven as changes required by context.¹ When this group of good changes is broken

¹1, 2, 4, 10, 11, 14-16, 18-23, 25-37, 42, 44, 48, 52-58.

down into the types under which I originally classified them, it appears that the editor supplied three omitted words; substituted one word for another eleven times; restored one rhyme; improved the verse five times; corrected seven speech-prefixes; corrected one, and added one stage-direction; corrected the grammar once, and improved the punctuation seven times.

In the second group, "changes which are understandable," I include some readings not strictly demanded by their context. But in all cases it is possible to perceive the motive which prompted the editor to make them, and frequently they improve the reading quality of the text. Of these there are sixteen,¹ which fall into the following classes: added word, three; substituted word, four; changed rhyme, one; different speech-prefix, one; added stage-direction, one; altered grammar, five; and altered punctuation, one.

In the third group I include such variants as can find no justification in their context, and such as are shown by the context to be mistaken. The number of these is six,² distributed as follows: substituted words, two; wrong speech-prefixes, three; and unnecessary change in grammar, one.

Of the modern editors of Cupid's Revenge, only Dyce has made a systematic effort to collate the three quartos; and his is, on the whole, the best edition of this play. Of the fifty-nine second quarto readings which I have here set forth, he adopts fifty-four. It is true that he does not follow the second quarto minutely in matters of punctuation or line arrangement in many of these variants; and in some cases he makes still further

¹3, 5-9, 17, 24, 38, 43, 46, 47, 49-51.

²12, 13, 39-41, 45.

revisions; but in the essential thing to be corrected, he agrees. He reproduces all that I placed in the first group, those demanded by context; of those in the second group he rejects only one; and he accepts two, and rejects four of those in the third group. I present these figures as being in some slight degree an objective measure of the quality of the work of the second quarto editor.

What are the general characteristics of the editor, as he is revealed by his work? What are his weaknesses, his competences, his special interests? There are several bits of evidence that are helpful. Most noticeable, perhaps, of all his traits is his lack of consistency. Very good and very bad changes stand side by side in the same sort of textual matter, as, for example, the speech-prefixes. He failed to observe a few glaring errors on the very pages where he made sound corrections.

It has already been suggested that one very important limit was imposed on the editor--he was denied any changes which would increase the number of lines per page. This limit cut down appreciably the number of lines, originally printed as prose, which he could change back to verse. Even so, he was able to make half a dozen such changes. These changes of prose back to verse; the additions of words, apparently for the sake of scansion; the restoration, or improvement, of rhyme; all these suggest that he had some little knowledge of the technique of versifying. He may have been well acquainted with the literature of his time.

He was, however, certainly more of a grammarian than a poet. His changes extend to tense forms, and possibly to the uses of the subjunctive mood; they seek exact usage of the intimate forms of the verb and pronoun; they concern themselves with the minute differences in use between "shall" and "will." Where the authors have availed themselves of poetic license in matters

of grammar, he consistently corrects them. Evidence has also been presented as the variants were analyzed to show that he was a competent Latinist; that he was a skilled reader; that he had some knowledge of play construction, and of the necessities of printing.

Mention has already been made of the fact that the third quarto of Cupid's Revenge, which followed the second after an interval of five years, was also edited. Its changes are not further revisions of those in Q2, except on rare occasions. They are rather corrections of errors, or things that its editor considered as errors, which had not been touched by the editor of Q2. Its title-page is as follows:

CUPIDS/ REVENGE./ AS IT WAS OFTEN/ Acted (with great
Aplause) by/ the Children of the Revels./ (Rule)/
Written by { FRAN: BEAUMONT, }
 and } Gentlemen./ (Rule)/
 IO: FLETCHER, }
The third Edition./ (Rule)/ (Ornament)/ (Rule)/
LONDON,/ Printed by A. M. 1635.

Collation: A-K4r; title-page, Alr; list of actors on Alv.

That this quarto is a reprint of Q2 can be established briefly: it copies almost exactly the title-page and the dramatis personae of Q2; it uses the same catchwords to the end of signature F; it retains all but two of the seventy-nine Q2 variants whose history I have traced through the subsequent editions; of the other variants between Q1 and Q2, of which there are almost a thousand, and which are almost all minor changes in punctuation and spelling, it accepts about ninety percent.

Since the important changes in Q3 are far less numerous than those in Q2; and since the editor's manner of working is very similar to that of his predecessor, I shall treat that quarto briefly, summarizing his work on a particular phase of his text rather than displaying the variants, except for a few of

especial interest. Page and line reference are to Q2, since the 1635 quarto is a reprint of that quarto; but the reference for Q1 would be the same, as would the text, except for very minor differences in spelling and punctuation. A page and line reference is also given for Q3.

The editor of the third quarto made some thirty-seven changes of the type that I have already treated under the heading of "Words." Not more than four of these are necessary changes. The motives for making twelve of them can be seen, though the changes themselves are not acceptable. There are twenty-one wrong changes, many of which are wrong only in the sense that they are completely unnecessary. I quote six of the editor's changes,¹ as showing necessary corrections, or having some bearing on the relationship between the two editorial efforts.

60. Q2: Cupid. Leucippus thou art shot through with a shaft
That will not rankle long, yet sharpe enough
To sowe a world of helpelesse miserie--
In this happie Kingdome,

(II, 1, Dlr, 25-28)

Q3: In this unhappy kingdome,

(II, 1, C2r, 28)

This change produces a line of ten syllables. It is a part of a passage of thirteen lines, wherein Cupid announces his revenge for the slight done him. The other twelve are all regular ten-syllable lines, an unusual situation in the work of Beaumont and Fletcher; and the addition of the extra syllable seems designed to bring this line into harmony, as far as verse is concerned, with the context. The speech predicts the unhappiness to come, so that "unhappy," considered as a description of a future state, rather than "happie," as describing the present, is not a completely unsatisfactory change.

¹Other interesting variants are to be found on C1r, 7; C1v, 3; E4v, 4-5; G4v, 23; I2r, 35; L2v, 27.

61. Q3: Tima. Worthy Ismenus, I pray you, how have you
sped in your wars?

(III, 11, F2r, 15-16)

The 1615 and 1630 readings of this same passage are quoted in variant number 12. An original "how" was changed to "you"; a comma was inserted to help the "how"; and then in Q3 the "how" is restored, while the "you" is retained--an interesting illustration of the manner in which corruptions can creep into a text. It has already been suggested that the original change from "how" to "you" may have been a compositor's mistake: that the Q3 editor, finding the Q2 reading faulty, should have re-inserted the "you" while retaining the "how," suggests two possibilities: (1) that the editor of Q3 did not have before him a copy of Q1; and (2) that he was not the person who was responsible for the original change. This latter possibility may have two implications: (1) that my original hypothesis that the Q1 change was a compositor's mistake is correct; or (2) that the two editors may have been different persons.

62. Q2: For as I liue ile pine thee, but ile haue thee

(II, vi, E4v, 26)

Q3: for/ as I live, ile pine for thee, but ile haue thee.

(II, vi, E4v, 25-26)

This change suggests that the editor of Q3 was not thoroughly familiar with his own language; "pine" is here of course the Middle English word, meaning according to the NED, "to afflict with pain or suffering." The addition makes a reading that is weaker, and entirely unnecessary.

63. Q1: Goe to your Maide, else what the olde man falls short
of, theres others can eech out, when you please to call
on em.

(II, vi, E4v, 28-30)

Q2: Goe too you Maide, else what the old man falls short

Q3: goe too you Mayd, what the old man fals short of,

(II, vi, E1v, 29)

The work of the editor of Q2 on this passage has been discussed

under number 11. The spaces left in the line in Q3 indicate that the deletion of "else" was probably made after the type was set; yet it appears in all copies of the third quarto which I have examined. It is, also, an isolated instance of the type's being deranged by a correction, and I do not believe that it indicates that any appreciable number of the other corrections was made during printing. It does suggest, on the other hand, that the editor of Q3 was not the same person who saw fit to retain the "else" in Q2.

64. Q2: Bac. Till yet be the Prince, you neede no more instructions.

(III, 1v, G3v, 35-36)

Q3: Bac. Till/ you see the Prince, you need no more instructions.

(III, 1v, F4v, 34-35)

The passage is obviously corrupt, for Bacha is not addressing the prince; the correction made here is acceptable to almost all the editors.

65. Q2: I weepe, I weepe for the poore Orphanes ith Countrey,
Left with but friends, or parents.

(IV, 1, H3r, 23-24)

Q3: Left with but friends, not parents.

(IV, 1, G4r, 8-9)

This line has been discussed by almost all the editors of the play; the generally accepted reading is "without friends or parents." It is my opinion that the Q1 reading, "friends; or," is that intended by the authors, and that the speech is a satirical reference to the question of wardships which was so disturbing an element in English politics in the years 1606-1610.

The editor of Q3 made no changes in rhyme, although one passage still remains which needs such a change. He did, however, restore to verse several lines which had in Q2 been retained as prose. There are nine such changes,¹ similar in character to

¹D3v, 14-15; G3v, 11-12; H3v, 14-15; H3v, 36 and H4r, 1; I4r, 9-10; I4r, 27-29; I4v, 13-14; L2r, 15-16.

those recorded for Q2, and to this one from Q3:

66. Q2: Leu. Now I feele my selfe the Poorest of all mortall things.

(V, iv, l1r, 17-18)

Q3: Leucippus. Now I feele my selfe
The Poorest of all mortall things.

(V, iv, Klv, 16-17)

It was on the speech-prefixes that we saw the Q2 editor making some of his worst efforts. His successor in Q3 found occasion to make five such changes, and all are necessary and correct. He removes one superfluous prefix;¹ he transfers one speech to the proper speaker;² he collects into one paragraph a speech printed in the first and second quartos as two paragraphs;³ he brings at least partial order to this confused arrangement:

67. Q2: Hero. Nothing, you do it not wantonly, you should sing
Hero. Leaue, leaue, tis now too late: Cleo. Why
Shee is dead: Hero. Her last is breathed.

(II, v, E3r, 32-34)

Q3: He. Nothing, you do it not wantonly, you should sing.
Cleo. Why. Hero. Leave, leave, tis now too late.
She is dead, her last is breathed.

(II, v, D4r, 32-34)

68. Finally, he corrects the glaring mistake made by the editor of Q2 which is discussed in number 40. This is the death-bed speech of Hidaspes, which is moved back to the preceding scene, and given to Timantus. This correction is evidence pointing to the fact that the editor who worked on Q3 was not the same man as the one who was concerned with Q2. It is difficult to suppose that one man should have seen the same passage in two such contrasted lights on two different occasions. On the other hand, it is possible to suppose it was the compositor, and not the editor, who made the error in Q2.

¹II, iv, E2v, 35.

²II, vi, E4r, 11.

³II, vi, E4r, 32-34.

The second quarto has only three changes in stage-directions, while the third has eight, most of which are acceptable, and one or two of which are excellent. The Q3 editor made three minor alterations, such as the addition of "and" or "enter";¹ he moved two directions, so that they would be closer to the point at which their action is performed;² he added "Exeunt." at the end of Act I; he made two important changes, worth recording, in that both reveal a close attention to context:

69. Q2: Leon. Timantus when saw you the Prince?
(III, iv, G2v, 31)
Q3: Enter Timantus.
Leon. Timantus when saw you the Prince?
(III, iv, F3v, 30-31)

At the beginning of the act, Timantus did not enter with the other characters; the conversation has gone on for sixty-four lines without his participation; his sudden appearance on the stage needs explanation.

70. The stage-direction in quartos 1 and 2 at the beginning of Act V is "Enter Vrania and her Woman." The woman has one speech, with the prefix "Wo.," then leaves the stage. Her exit is marked by "Exit M." The "M" may possibly be an inverted "W," and represent a printer's error; or it may be a confusion of "woman" with "maid"; at any rate, it is corrected in Q3 to "Exit Wom."

The headings for acts and scenes are left in Q3 exactly as they appeared in Q2. There remained something for the editor to do, since, as I pointed out, the second quarto editor introduced one mistake, and failed to change three incorrect Latin words. While little value can be attached to such negative evidence, there is at least nothing of a positive character to indicate that the Q3 editor was a Latinist.

¹I, ii, B4r, 15; I, iii, C2r, 5-6; IV, ii, Ilv, 18.

²II, v, E3r, 12; IV, i, H2r, 21.

The revisions in Q2 included most of the obvious errors in grammar; of the genuine errors that remained, the editor of Q3 found two; and he made one change of doubtful value.

71. Q2: And on the first heart that despise my Greatnesse,
Lay a strange misery,
Q3: And on the first heart that despis'd my greatnesse,
(I, ii, Clr, 28-29)
(I, ii, B2r, 28)
72. Q2: Agenor. Why how would you haue had him dyde?
(II, iii, Elv, 4)
Q3: Age. Why, how would you have had him dye?
(II, iii, D2v, 4)
73. Q2: Leu. To what end should I keepe em?
(IV, v, Klr, 4)
Q3: Leu. To what end shall I keepe 'um?
(IV, v, Ilv, 16)

There is nothing in the context to call for this change. We have seen the editor of the second quarto making a well considered change from "will" to "shall";¹ that the editor of Q3 should also be interested in this particular phase of grammar is a slight indication that the two editors may be the same person. Yet such an assumption is counterbalanced by the fact that this change is so much inferior to that one.

One group of changes in spelling is highly interesting because of the light it throws on the question of identity of editorship in the two quartos. One of the characters, Urania, the daughter of Bacha, speaks always in dialect. A study of this dialect has been made by Herr Eduard Eckhardt, in his Die Dialekt- und Ausländer-typen des "ältern Englischen Dramas".² He finds Urania's speech to be Northern, with some Scottish words, though it also contains many vulgar and archaic forms, and he comments

¹Variant number 8.

²Eduard Eckhardt, Die Dialekt- und Ausländer-typen des ältern Englischen Dramas, (Louvain: A. Uystpruyst, 1910).

that Beaumont and Fletcher's knowledge of the Northern dialect is "mangelhafte."¹ The person who edited Q2 carefully refrained from changing dialect words. The editor of Q3, on the other hand, made several changes which appear to be designed to improve the dialect.² Yet they show no consistent tendency toward any one dialect, nor do they show knowledge of dialect greater to any extent than that exhibited by the spellings of the first quarto. The changes which I present in the note, can only be considered as corruptions in the text. The facts which I wish to emphasize are that Q2 carefully avoided such changes, and that Q3 as carefully made them. That the editor knew he was dealing with dialect is evidenced by such a change as that of "wrong" to "wrang." We seem to have here, therefore, a bit of evidence that the two editors were not the same person.

The punctuation of the third quarto, taken as a whole, is much better than that of either of the others. There are few obvious mistakes, such as the substitution of an incorrect question mark for a correct period, or the placing of a comma at the end of a speech. Of the 498 punctuation changes in Q2, Q2 accepts 390; it further changes fifty-one; and it restores fifty-seven first quarto readings. This latter group represents largely corrections of the errors in punctuation introduced into Q2, presumably by the compositor. In addition to its treatment of these Q2 readings, Q3 introduces a fresh group of changes, to the number of 813, most of which are unimportant in relation to the text,

¹Ibid., pp. 83-86.

²"fene"= fain to "feine" (IV, 1, H2r, 25, and G3r, 14); "weas" to "weyes" (IV, 1, H2v, 4, and G3r, 29); "wrong" to "wrang" (IV, 1, H2v, 11, and G3r, 34); "whaire" to "where" (V, 1, K2r, 30, and I3r, 1); "Day"= die, to "daye" (V, 1, K2v, 15, and I3r, 19); "ai" (article) to "a" (V, 1, K3r, 19, and I3v, 22).

and can probably be attributed to the compositor. There are a few, however, as in the second quarto, which represent thoughtful consideration of context. The following is one of the most effective changes:

74. Q2: Tel. Sir, heere's your sword.
Leon. O well sed: let me see it, I could me thinkes.
 Why Telamon, bring me another: what, thinkst thou
 I will weare a sword in vaine?
Tela. He has not strength enough to draw it,
 (II, iv, E2v, 26-30)
 Q3: Leon. O well sed: let me see it, I could me thinks---
 (II, iv, D2v, 27)

After I had displayed a group of the second quarto variants, I sought to evaluate the quality of the editorship as a whole by summarizing the variants under three general heads: changes required by context; changes which are understandable, or which are perhaps improvements from a literary point of view, but which are not essential for clarity; and changes which are useless, or even wrong. Not enough of the Q3 variants have been reproduced to furnish a basis for such an analysis. The few printed were chosen either as examples of a particular kind of change, or as indications of the characteristics of the man who worked on Q3. It will be recalled that in the introductory section of this chapter a group of fifty third quarto variants was pointed out, which were used as a basis for the study, and whose history was traced through the subsequent editions of the play. This group of fifty variants, when broken down into the three classes just named, shows twenty necessary changes, sixteen understandable, and fourteen wrong. The same breaking down for the fifty-nine second quarto changes reproduced in the paper showed thirty-seven, sixteen, and six as the figures for the three groups. These figures show that the proportion of good changes to bad ones is much higher in Q2; and they furnish, I think, a fairly just estimate

of the relative excellence of the tasks of editorship.

Were the quartos of 1630 and 1635 edited by the same man, or by two different men? I have sought to point out, as I considered the variants, any evidence that might be useful in solving this problem. Certain general characteristics have appeared, belonging almost equally to both editorial efforts: close study of context; interest in almost all phases of the dramatic manuscript; interest in grammar and verse; and lack of respect, from a textual point of view, for the words of the authors.

Beyond such general resemblances, however, there has been little to suggest that the same man is responsible for both tasks. Evidence that the two editors were not the same man is by no means conclusive; but it is much stronger than any evidence to the contrary. The editor of Q2 did a much better job; he has a higher percentage of needed corrections, and a much lower of foolish ones. He was interested in the Latin that he found in the play, and was able to correct it acceptably; none of the changes in Q3 affects the Latin. The editor of Q2 did not alter the dialect, while the editor of Q3 changed parts of it, not to standard English, but simply to other dialect spellings. In Q2, the changes in the lyrics, and in the rhyme, suggest an editor with some knowledge of literary forms beyond the drama. The interest of the editor of Q3 extended no farther than one or two changes that might affect the scansion. And finally, Q3 corrects three of the corrections made by Q2.

Such evidence, of course, is inconclusive; but any value it has is directed to the hypothesis of two editors for the two quartos, rather than one for both.

A further step can be taken, however, with greater confidence--the naming of the man responsible for both of these edito-

rial efforts, the man who caused them to be carried out. He is the A. M. who appears in the imprint of Q3. That he was Augustine Mathewes, and that he was also the printer of the second quarto, can be established by means of the ornamental devices in the two quartos. The title-page ornaments for Q2 and Q3 are identical, and are similar to number 379 in McKerrow's Printers' and Publishers' Devices, which he describes as "A mask with rings." That used by Mathewes is not, however, the same cutting as that which McKerrow shows. The same cutting as that of the two quartos of Cupid's Revenge appears in Thomas May's The Heire, printed by "A. Mathewes for T. Jones. 1633." It also appears on the title-page of The Present Estate of Spayne, by James Wadsworth, 1630. The A. M. of its imprint is identified in the Short Title Catalogue as Augustine Mathewes, as is the A. M. of the third quarto of Cupid's Revenge. The ornamental "T" on page Blr of Q2, though not used in Q3, appears again and again in another book printed by Mathewes in 1631.¹ The border ornament of Blr, Q2 and Alv, Q3 is to be found in three other imprints by Mathewes of about the same date as the second quarto of Cupid's Revenge.² The head-piece on A2r, Q3 is another ornamental border; in a slightly different combination of its parts, it is used as the title-page ornament of Lingua; or the Combat of the Tongue, by Thomas Tomkis, a Mathewes imprint of 1632.

The copyright of Cupid's Revenge had passed from the orig-

¹G. B. Knight, Of the Universities of England, "printed by Augustine Mathewes for Richard Meighen. 1631." Pages, 1077, 1080, 1084. Another cutting of the same ornament appears on pages, 1077, 1080, 1087.

²Francis Hubert, Egypt's Favorite, 1631; Francis Markham, The Booke of Honour, 1624; James Wadsworth, The Present Estate of Spayne, 1630.

inal holder, Josias Harison, to Thomas Jones on April, 1619.¹ On October 24, 1633, Jones transferred to Mathewes thirteen of his copyrights, one of which was Cupid's Revenge.² These facts, together with the evidence of the ornaments, seem sufficient to establish that Mathewes printed the second quarto, and that he was both printer and publisher of the 1635 edition.

During the decade ending in 1635, three men, Thomas Jones, Richard Hawkins, and Augustine Mathewes were particularly interested in the plays of Beaumont and Fletcher. Jones owned the copyrights to The Scornful Lady³ and Cupid's Revenge, but transferred both to Mathewes in 1633. The Maid's Tragedy, Philaster, and A King and No King belonged to Hawkins.⁴ By the end of 1635, nine editions of these plays had appeared, each bearing the imprint of one or more of these men. Augustine Mathewes was associated with four of these editions as printer, and with two as both printer and publisher.⁵ There was a certain amount of editorship in each play with which he was associated.⁶ Since he was both printer and publisher of two of the quartos in question, he was solely responsible for whatever editorship they received. He was associated far more frequently, in his dual capacity of printer

¹Arber, op. cit., III, 646.

²Arber, op. cit., IV, 307.

³Arber, op. cit., III, 608.

⁴Arber, op. cit., IV, 194, 212.

⁵As printer: Philaster, 1628; Maid's Tragedy, 1630; Cupid's Revenge, 1630; King and No King, 1631. As printer and publisher, Scornful Lady and Cupid's Revenge, 1635.

⁶For confirmation of the facts set forth in the above note(except concerning Cupid's Revenge) and for brief descriptions of these editorial treatments, consult the introductions to the various plays in the Variorum Edition of the works of Beaumont and Fletcher.

and publisher, with the work on the group of plays than either Jones or Hawkins.¹ I suggest that the initiative Mathewes displayed when he had the entire authority in two of the plays may have been asserted earlier, and that he may have been the moving spirit in causing the earlier publications to be edited.

This chapter, has, I believe, established the fact that both the 1630 and the 1635 editions of Cupid's Revenge received thoroughgoing editorial revisions at the hands of men not without some just pretensions to the designation of men of letters. It has pointed out that the two editors were probably two different men. It has identified Augustine Mathewes as the printer of the 1630 quarto, and has suggested that he is the man most likely to have caused this editorial work to be done.

¹There is interesting material for further investigation in connection with the work of this group of men. Studies of the other editorial efforts similar to the one I have made for the two quartos of Cupid's Revenge might be valuable. The possibility that they contemplated an edition of Beaumont and Fletcher, and the later history of their copyrights, are also fruitful fields for investigation.

